



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Shaws and Hamilton Holts now plead for universal peace through unlimited arbitration. Senators Bacon and Lodge and Heyburn and Hitchcock, apparently impelled by constitutional prerogative, party prejudice, or personal animosity, now cast the votes for limitations in the name of honor. From the platform of peace conferences, from the halls of colleges, from the pulpit and the bench, from the offices of bankers and merchants and manufacturers, from the press with scarcely a column's exception, there arises a swelling plea for treaties of arbitration that know no exceptions. In the name of honor that plea is defied.

Honor? No; an ocean of exception large enough to float any number of battleships for which pride and ambition may be willing to pay! Honor? No; a finical and foolish reservation that at any moment may become a maelstrom of suspicion and rage and hatred and destruction and death! Honor? No; a mountainous barrier to peace that must be leveled before there can be progress! Honor? No; the incarnation of selfishness, the cloak of shrewd politics, the mask of false patriotism! National honor? No; national dishonor!

Before the nations of the world the United States stands today in an unenviable light. It is a false light. Since the days of William Penn and Benjamin Franklin our people have led in much of the march upward from the slough of weltering strife. Many a stumbling-block to progress we have removed from the rugged pathway; but for fifteen years our Government has refused to touch the barrier of national honor and vital interests. England and France have now laid this duty squarely at our door. "It is a social obligation as imperative as the law of Moses, as full of hope as the Great Physician's healing touch." Let us here highly resolve that there shall be uttered a new official interpretation of national honor and vital interests, an interpretation synonymous with dignity and fidelity, sincerity and integrity, and confidence in the vows both of men and of nations. "If we have 'faith in the right as God gives us to see the right,' we shall catch a vision of opportunity that shall fire the soul with a spirit of service which the darkness of night shall not arrest, which the course of the day shall not weary."



President Taft's Arbitration Policy.

**Address of Hon. Richard Bartholdt on the Naval Appropriation Bill in the House of Representatives,
May 23, 1912.**

Mr. BARTHOLDT: Mr. Chairman, this year the battleship question finds me in a state of mind bordering on equanimity, if not indifference. The reason is, probably, that every one knows in advance what its final disposition will be. The majority in the House will uphold the action of the Democratic caucus by refusing new authorizations, the Senate will insist on at least one new battleship, and the House will finally yield to a program, so wisely limited, in order to keep the navy at its present efficiency.

Now, if my friends on the other side were actuated by a higher motive than that of mere economy I could probably get up some enthusiasm. If they had said the United States is in the best possible position to set the world an example by calling a halt to the mad

rivalry for excessive armaments, I would be tempted to take my hat off to them; but as it seems to be a question not of principle but of parsimony with them, a desire merely of making a showing, at the end of the session, of surplus cash rather than investments in behalf of the Government, I cannot help but feel more or less unconcerned, although I must say that the action of the Democratic caucus has served one good purpose—it has saved us from the annual Japanese war scare.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another and more cogent reason why the friends of peace and arbitration view the question of naval armaments with less concern now than they did even a few years ago. They have seen the light break in. An antidote has been found for the folly of the nations, and it may now safely be predicted that it is only a question of a short time when, through the force of public sentiment, arbitration will take the place of war in the settlement of international differences and when the nations will march, figuratively speaking, from abandoned battlefields to the Temple of Justice, there calmly to await the verdict of impartial judges in every case which threatens to disturb their peace. While it is true that governments cannot be persuaded to discard their implements of war so long as they actually need them for purposes of defense and national security, it is just as certain that no nation would maintain them much beyond the period when their absolute uselessness, except for police purposes, has been demonstrated. Hence, I hold that the question of armaments will solve itself. Its proper solution will be the natural sequence of the perfection of the legal machinery for the administration of international justice.

It is this question which I desire to discuss today. If the above premises are correct, then it becomes the patriotic duty of every good citizen by his vote and influence to hasten the day when in the intercourse of the nations judicial decisions will be recognized as the proper substitute for the arbitrament of the sword, proper because more humane, more civilized, and infinitely more economical.

Fortunately we are no longer in doubt as to how this great purpose can be accomplished. The consensus of opinion of the world's best thinkers is fixed upon three postulates, namely, general arbitration treaties, a high court of nations, and a code of international law to be sanctioned by all the national legislative bodies and enforced by the combined police powers of the world.

Thanks to the two Hague conferences, this plan is no longer a dream of visionaries or a vision of dreamers, nor is it the half-baked scheme of progressives who are overestimating the speed of rational advance. It is much more than that. It has become the concrete project upon which the governments of the whole world have concentrated their official minds ever since a President of the United States had the courage and the foresight to propose the settlement by arbitration of all justiciable questions. [Applause.]

Before I discuss President Taft's arbitration policy let me show you how far the plan of a high court of nations has progressed. Such a court has been a reality ever since 1899, when the first Hague conference created it in the shape of a panel from which a court was to be organized in each given case. While this court has officiated in a number of important cases to the full satisfaction of the world's opinion, yet there was a gen-

eral demand for a tribunal with real judicial powers, and this led to the unanimous declaration by the second Hague conference in favor of a court of arbitral justice. All the signatory powers represented at that conference assented to its immediate establishment, and only the question of the appointment, or, rather, the distribution, of the judges caused disagreement and has been the stumbling-block up to the present time in the way of its actual creation. There is no question, however, that the next conference of the powers, which will meet in Holland's capital in 1915, will remove this obstacle and crown its labors with what, in my judgment, will be the most glorious achievement of modern times. A code of international law to apply to the cases which may be brought before the court the same as an agreement as to the executive power to enforce, if need be, the decrees of such a world tribunal will follow its establishment just as surely as the *lex scripta* and the sheriffs became the creatures of domestic courts. It is needless to say that every arbitration treaty negotiated between two or more governments will form an integral part of the international code.

After this brief review of past achievements and aspirations for the future, let me discuss the most important event in the history of the modern peace movement, namely, President Taft's proposition to arbitrate all justiciable questions. I need not recount how this progressive plan electrified the world and how, through it, the United States suddenly assumed leadership in fact, and not in name only, in the great movement for international justice. The first to criticize was Theodore Roosevelt, and it is my purpose to answer, on behalf of the supporters of the arbitration treaties, the objections he raised against the President's great conception. I shall do so, of course, with entire disregard of the present political situation.

The former President insists that questions of honor and vital interest should always be excepted from the scope of arbitration treaties, because not to do that is to waive at the outset a possible arbitrament by the sword—which would be hypocrisy and cowardice. No self-respecting nation, he says, would resort to arbitration when its honor is at stake, and, besides, such an agreement could not be enforced when a nation believes it has real cause for war.

This sounds good, and the unthinking, no doubt, will applaud the argument. But if it were to prevail, the world would forever be where it is today. Here Mr. Roosevelt is plainly the stand-patter or reactionary, while the President is the progressive. The fact is, that hypocrisy and cowardice are the characteristics of the present system rather than of the newly proposed. Under our present feeble treaties every controversy can easily be magnified to the proportions of a question of honor or vital interest; hence these old treaties making such exemptions are not worth the paper they are written upon, and therefore it was hardly compatible with upright and honorable conduct for nations to pretend favoring arbitration when in fact they knew they could open the door to war at any time they saw fit to do so.

In comparison with this hypocritical system which Mr. Roosevelt upholds, President Taft's proposal is the very embodiment of honesty. It presupposes honorable conduct on the part of nations; and is based on the right-
ful assumption that no nation conducting itself honorably need ever fear the verdict of an impartial tribunal.

It is this consideration which prompted the President to say that questions of honor are really the easiest to arbitrate. The time is happily past when one civilized nation will wantonly insult another, and it is also true that in this time and day monarchical rulers can no longer use an alleged insult as a subterfuge to arouse, by appeals to the national honor, the furor of the people. A more frequent intercourse and more rapid communication between the people of different nations, and the growth of popular education and of a better understanding among them have become the reliable safeguards against such tricks. We must also remember that the great nations, in spite of their armaments, are no longer independent and hostile military camps frowning upon each other as implacable enemies, but they have gradually come to regard each other as interdependent parts of the great family of nations ready and willing to investigate, before cutting throats, whether an insult is real or fancied, or whether it was offered intentionally or not. And we know that war is always as good as prevented when consent is once obtained for an investigation.

Mr. Roosevelt justifies war from the feelings of an individual, saying in so many words that nations should act just as a man would when his wife is assailed and has her face slapped. "Such an individual," he says, "who went to law instead of forthwith punishing the offender would be regarded with derision." This case belongs clearly in the category of self-defense, and no friend of peace has ever denied this to a nation. Defense presupposes an attack, but we must be sure that there is an attack before we are allowed to take the law in our own hands. If domestic law permits no exception to that rule, except in case of a physical attack, why should an exception be permitted in international law merely to continue the bloody business of war? We know full well that many cases of law violation occur because human passion is often stronger than respect for law, but surely this is no reason why there should be no law against certain offenses, nor is it a reason why exceptions should be recognized in international law framed, as it is, to safeguard the peace. To leave it to individual judgment when to resort to law or to force will lead to anarchy just as surely as it will lead to war if we leave such discretion to governments and nations. The prohibition of violence is the universal rule of law. The breaking of that rule, no matter how justifiable, is the breaking of law, and President Taft simply aims to apply this principle to international relations. The doctrine preached by Mr. Roosevelt of permitting exceptions would lead to the same intolerable conditions in domestic affairs as now exist in foreign relations, namely, that the arbitrary will of the individual can menace the peace of society. As the ruler can declare war at will on the plea of an injury to honor or vital interests, so could the individual citizen justify acts of violence because of want or hunger or misery or of personal insult. President Taft's proposition, therefore, to make the law of nations conform to domestic law is a step in advance from dangerous conditions of anarchy to a higher plane of international law and order.

Moreover, a resort to violence is the poorest possible way to resent an insult. War never settles a question of right or wrong; it only determines which side is the strongest, and might is not right. Therefore a trial by battle would be wrong even if all nations were equally

strong. But how would it be if a weak nation should be insulted by a big and powerful one? Suppose Great Britain should offer an insult to little Holland, and to save their honor the Dutch people should decide to fight. What would be the result? We should see injury added to insult, and an unequal war between the two would most likely result in the complete annihilation of Holland. Would we be justified in charging the Dutch with cowardice when they prefer judicial decisions to a war which would inevitably wipe them from the map? The fact is they are just as brave as we are, but that does not carry with it the obligation to commit national suicide. Still less justifiable is the reproach of cowardice when a great and powerful country like the United States at a time of profound peace proposes to other great countries that all their future controversies shall be settled by arbitration. Such a proposition, on the contrary, seems the very acme of dignity, honor, and manhood, and every government which values justice and is willing to forego illegitimate gain by force will so regard it.

Mr. Roosevelt cites the hypothetical case of an English or German or Japanese fleet "firing into our coast towns and killing and wounding citizens," and says, in such an event, "this nation would immediately demand not arbitration, but either atonement or war;" but surely this is no argument against arbitration. In fact, our Government proposes arbitration to prevent just such contingencies. When a hostile fleet once bombards our coast towns, then the stage of arbitration is passed, and such bombardment would simply be a declaration of war as an evidence that arbitration has failed. But you notice that here again the ex-President cites a case calling for legitimate self-defense which has no application whatsoever to President Taft's plan. No nation will forfeit, by arrangements to settle its controversies peacefully, its inherent right of self-defense.

The importance of President Taft's initiative may not as yet be fully appreciated by the people. It will not come home to them until, as a result of such a policy, hundreds of millions will be annually saved to the taxpayers. All thinking men and women regard it even today as one of the greatest world reforms ever undertaken, and no one doubts its entire practicability. We may thoughtlessly repeat the phrase, "There must always be war," but I sincerely believe Taft's arbitration policy to be the beginning of its end, and we should all be happy to have lived to see the day of this great beginning through the initiative of an American President. Neither the Senate, which mutilated the arbitration treaties, nor Mr. Roosevelt, who has opposed them from the beginning, will be able to halt the triumphant progress of evolution. It is the manifest destiny of human civilization to found the world's peace on the rock of law and render it secure against the passion of the masses as well as against the arbitrary will of rulers. To popularize this great purpose through the sheer force of its own merit and to fructify it as a fixed policy of government, I earnestly believe to be America's greatest mission in the politics of the world, and no good American will ever recognize either the Constitution or the Senate of the United States to be a lasting obstacle in the way of its accomplishment.

The friends of arbitration do not hug the delusion that war can be abolished with one fell swoop. They know that the idols of the tribe will prevail for a time,

against the ideals of humanity. It seems to be man's way to exhaust the possibilities of every folly and every iniquity before he will fall back upon the methods of wisdom and goodness. But even today the philosophy of history is able to characterize war as a blunder, ethics as barbarism, law as a crime, and religion as a sin. The world's hope is not a lie, and, in the language of America's greatest poet, "Man will not forever be the slave of his own passions." Moltke, it is true, declared that "Eternal peace is only a dream, however beautiful it may be." Yet a giant thinker of the same nation wrote an immortal treatise on the same "perpetual peace," and came to the conclusion that it is—

"No mere empty idea, but rather we have here a problem which gradually works out its own salvation, and as the periods in which a given advance takes place toward the realization of the ideal of perpetual peace will, we hope, become shorter and shorter, we must approach ever nearer to this goal."

"Yesterday—

Says Walter Walsh, in his great book, "The Moral Damage of War":

"Yesterday the saint aspired, today the poet dreams, tomorrow the sage will expound, and on the fourth day the statesman will embody in a bill."

At every rung on the ladder humanity has been assured the next step up will be impracticable, impossible, but the only prophesies that remain unfulfilled are those of pessimism and unfaith. Mr. Wiseman assures humanity she can never cross the red sea of war, but she kindles her flaming enthusiasm and comes to her new world, her Columbia, her land of peace. Faith is not a fool. She surveys all the obstacles, ponders all the difficulties, counts all the opponents, measures all the "impossibilities," and then sings serenely with Scotia's great national bard:

"For a' that and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that.
That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be, for a' that."

[Applause.]

MR. HOBSON: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BARTHOLDT: Certainly.

MR. HOBSON: Will the gentleman, before he takes his seat, permit me to say that it is a source of great pleasure to me to have listened to his treatment in such an able way of the question of arbitration without mixing it up with the question of armament, and to say that I am happy to be able to agree with him thoroughly upon his speech today. [Applause.]

MR. BARTHOLDT: Mr. Chairman, it affords me great happiness, indeed, to discover that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] and I have ever been able to agree upon a question of this kind. [Laughter.]

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BARTHOLDT: Certainly.

MR. BOWMAN: As an observation in connection with the gentleman's remarks, does he recall the expression used by Andrew Carnegie, "No man ever touched another man's honor. All honor's wounds are self-inflicted?"

MR. BARTHOLDT: I do not recall those words.

MR. BUTLER: Are they Andrew Carnegie's exact words?

MR. BOWMAN: They are quoted as his words,